

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

PIN: 6884
APPLICANT NAME: Freeport Regional Water Authority
PROJECT TITLE: Central and South Sacramento County Regional Water Partnership Initiatives
FUNDS REQUESTED: \$ 50,000,000
COST MATCH: \$198,400,000
TOTAL PROJECT COST: \$248,400,000

DESCRIPTION: The proposal includes four projects that meet regional and state goals and objectives for water supply reliability, environmental restoration and stormwater quality control. The four projects include; The Freeport Regional Water Project which will provide infrastructure necessary to convey Sacramento River water to Sacramento County Water Agency and East Bay Municipal Utility District; The SRCSD Recycling Plant Upgrade and Expansion which will increase the quantity of available recycled water in the region; The TNC River Management and Conjunctive Use Management Opportunities of the Cosumnes River Project which will install a number of new piezometers, temperature gages, and retrofit older piezometers, along the Cosumnes River for development of a river-aquifer management plan, and The County of Sacramento Low Flow Drainage Project, which will construct low flow diversions that route urban runoff from the storm drain system and redirects it into the sanitary sewer system.

Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.

Pass

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1. 5

All 5 member or participating agencies of the Central and South Sacramento County Regional Water Partnership (CSSCRWP) adopted the FED in June, 2005. Copies of resolution documents showing adoption of the FEP were provided in the application.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1. 3

Not all agency boundaries are shown. EBMUD's, the main project sponsor, boundaries are outside of the region. Other maps do not include all of the regional members' jurisdictions. Individual maps detail water facilities, watershed boundaries, and groundwater contours. Other planning efforts, population projections, land use divisions, and water management facilities and agency responsibilities are discussed. Conveyance facilities and pipe or canal capacities are not included. Shared resources and facilities, existing regional planning organizations, and shared or overlapping management responsibilities are cited as the reason for the region's appropriateness for integrated management. This application covers, in part, the southern portion of Sacramento County. PIN 6336 covers, in part, the northern portion of Sacramento County. Both applicants have indicated that they envision a consolidated region. The need for separate regions is questionable.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1. 3

The objectives are very detailed, and past success of integration are cited, such as the Sacramento Water Forum Agreement. Also discussed is the ongoing Central Sacramento County Groundwater Forum. The CSSCRWP is made up of the agencies participating in this proposal, and there is overlap. What is not discussed is how these agencies work together. Facts such as how often or how long they have been meeting, public input process, or the project weighting criteria are lacking. A matrix of the objectives as compared to goals and Strategies/Projects is included and shows the objective(s) that each Strategies/Projects fulfills. There is a short section discussing water related conflicts in the region, and programs to address the conflicts.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1. 5

15 strategies are included in the FED and described with some background information. Projects and programs designed to fulfill each strategy are listed with all 15 strategies. Synergy between strategies can be seen in the table comparing strategies and projects with objectives.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

3

Priority for projects was determined by a readiness to proceed evaluation coupled with the comparison against the objectives in the FED. 4 priority projects were selected and 38 others not yet ready for implementation. There was very little explanation of how the projects were selected. The process by which priorities will be modified is vague. Timelines for the 4 projects are provided, but details on the large scale IRWMP for the entire County are not. The process for local input and response cited by the applicant is said to be the partner and stakeholder group established in developing the FED.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

5

The applicant provides a discussion of the project and studies that are ongoing or planned for FED implementation. The agency responsible for each project is provided, as is the current status of each of the 4 proposed projects. General timelines are stated for long-term efforts, while a brief Gantt chart is provided for each of the 4 proposed projects. Linkages and interdependencies between projects are discussed in narrative form and in Table 27. The institutional structure for the overall coordinated effort in the region will be the CSSCRWP and responsible agencies or groups are identified in the application.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

4

Potential impacts and benefits within the region, to/for other resources, to/for DAC's, and to/for other regions are identified in Section 10 of the FED. Advantages of regional planning efforts over and above individual entity planning efforts are noted and described under the topics of increased regional understanding, economies of scale, and fostering project/plan support. A more complete discussion of Sacramento River/Delta impacts could have been included.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

5

A fairly thorough discussion is provided detailing the technical methods and analyses used in plan development. Evaluation criteria, data inputs, and oversight responsibility is addressed in general and in additional detail for the four select implementation projects in Section 11. Means of data collection and analysis are listed for the 4 proposed projects. Data gaps are identified and are provided in detail for Cosumnes River Project. Under the implementation project narratives, project planners have identified ways in which the assumptions and specifications inherent to the work will be verified and refined using the data collected to fill existing gaps. The use of the data will be in modeling studies for calibration to historical conditions and for predictive analyses.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The discussion of management of data generated during plan development/implementation is vague and does not provide a good sense of whether a GIS or databases were developed or what types of information sets currently exist. The applicant states that a Data Management System will be developed, but further information is not provided. The applicant states that monitoring of individual project activity will be the duty of the responsible agencies and provides an example and some means by which collected information would be disseminated to stakeholders and the public. Data collection will be coordinated and data shared with CERES, SWAMP, and GAMA when appropriate and feasible.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant identified funding/financing for the 4 proposed projects, but does not include financing plans for the long-term projects not including in the proposal. The discussion of ongoing support and financing of the 4 projects is somewhat vague. A brief discussion of project benefit recipients both within and outside of the region is included. More detail to establish readiness to proceed based on known and secure funding needs, plans, or mechanisms for the 4 implementation projects would have helped to justify the proposal.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant states that the FED serves as a unifying document for previous local and regional planning efforts. The FED utilizes existing organizations as points of contact to guide implementation project actions to avoid inconsistency. Various local plans already in existence or in development are listed in Section 15.3. However, there is not a clear understanding of how previous planning documents relate to current projects. It is also unclear on how this FED can serve as a unifying document for water management in Sacramento County when PIN 6336 is also undertaking such planning. Section 14 of the FED identifies statewide priorities with respect to different agencies and program directives and cites specific projects included in the FED that address the goals of the priorities.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

3

Participation of the 37 federal, State, local and organizations were involved, along with their mission or purpose, is discussed. However stakeholder identification was not. Methods for stakeholder outreach efforts are listed. The lead agencies are described, as well as the partnerships between them. DACs have been identified in the region and are shown on a map. The applicant notes coordination needs by agency and lists forums or items expected during implementation, but falls short of project level detail regarding specific agency actions or decisions required for project implementation.

Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match. Pass or Fail.

Pass

Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

12

Beneficial uses of the project include new municipal supply development; non-potable supply and infrastructure planning; low flow diversion to WWTP from storm water sewer discharging systems; and rural, urban, agricultural, and habitat demand on an undammed stream feeding the Mokelumne River. There is no discussion of how stream flow return losses relate to reduced pollutant loading dynamics of the low flow drain project. Measures implemented to stem the NPS flow of contaminants from the storm sewer system include rubber dams, mechanical valves, and grated outlets to the sanitary sewer system. More effort should have been spent discussing the Freeport Project's water rights on and impacts to the Sacramento River.

Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

8

The applicant discusses in detail the process by which projects within the region were prioritized, which resulted in the 4 projects being proposed. The FED includes long-term projects as well as the 4 short-term projects selected for the proposal. The applications were sufficiently detailed to understand how the proposal relates to the FED. A table is included which lists the results of how the projects fulfill twelve prioritization criteria/questions. The inter-regional aspects of the proposal are not addressed sufficiently. The main project contained in the proposal provides a significant portion of its benefits outside of the region. It is unclear how the priorities of these projects relate to the prioritized project in PIN 6336, which covers the rest of Sacramento County.

Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The budget costs included in the application are provided for the proposal as a whole, and for each implementation project. Only the Freeport project identifies the source of project funds outside the grant request. The applicant indicates the source of non-state funds for is from developer fees and bonds. Right of way and property acquisition, monitoring planning, field work, preparation of construction documents, CEQA/NEPA, permitting, installation, and post construction and mitigation planning are included in the cost estimates. The supporting documentation does not contain sufficient detail, but the cost estimate appears to be reasonable.

Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

4

A Gantt chart is provided for the whole of the proposal, with duration, dependencies, and dates. The schedule closely reflects the items in the proposal budget. More information on the water rights and other permit applications in addition to environmental compliance document milestone dates would help to understand and affirm the readiness to proceed for the proposal as a whole. 2 of the projects reportedly have completed CEQA/NEPA, 1 project has an exemption, and 1 is expected to have an exemption by October 2006.

Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

8

The need for the proposal is shown in the history of the Water Forum Agreement and other regional planning and coordination activities. Overdraft of groundwater led to the need for water recycling and use of more surface water. The projects develop new supplies/or optimize existing supplies to improvise water supply reliability. Water quality of Lower American River would be improved by the low flow project. The Freeport Project will provide infrastructure to supply up to 85 MGD of water, as part of a conjunctive use program. The Cosumnes Project may be redundant of other work in the area. It is unclear in the main need for the Freeport Project is for the region described in the application or exterior to that region (i.e. the San Francisco Bay Area).

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2, please use a score of 0, 2, 4, 6, 8, or 10.

6

The applicant states that the 4 projects will benefit the entire region, including DACs. The application provide the project benefits to DAC's in their region, and breaks out the percentage and benefits for DAC's for each project, along with methodology for determining the benefit. The benefits are general in nature and not directly targeted to DACs.

Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The projects provide multiple benefits; however, it is unclear if they are truly integrated. The water supply reliability is enhanced through reducing groundwater overdraft. Local supply reliability is a primary goal of the plans to augment surface water supplies with recycled water for non-potable use and a new Sacramento River screened diversion facility. The low flow drainage project would reduce pollutant discharges in stormwater runoff. All projects have a component that will reduce pollution in impaired waters or sensitive habitat areas. The drainage project would improve Sacramento River water quality of existing and planned water supply diversion intake structures. The projects do not directly target DACs. Although the proposal may provide the groundwater management benefits claimed, it does not meet this preference since the proposal is not located in Southern California.

Question: Additional Comments

TOTAL SCORE: 90